

Effect of a Quenched Disorder on the Order Parameter of Superfluid ^3He

I. A. Fomin

P. L. Kapitza Institute for Physical Problems, ul. Kosygina 2, 119334 Moscow, Russia

Abstract. As a consequence of continuous degeneracy of the order parameter of the superfluid ^3He quenched disorder in a form of aerogel gives rise both to a disruption of the orientational long-range order of the condensate and to a significant change of the order parameter itself. There exist a class of quasi-isotropic order parameters which are not sensitive to the disorienting effect of aerogel. While the BW order parameter belongs to this class the ABM does not. Possible candidate for the order parameter of the observed A-like phase is discussed.

Average distance ξ_a between the strands of high porosity aerogels introduced as impurities in the superfluid ^3He [1, 2] does not differ much from the superfluid coherence length ξ_0 . This property is in a conflict with the condition of applicability of the conventional theory of superconducting alloys [3] $n\xi_0^3 \gg 1$, where n is the average density of impurities. In aerogels $n\xi_0^3 \sim 1$ and fluctuations of $n\xi_0^3$ are significant. In a vicinity of the transition temperature T_c effect of fluctuations can be described phenomenologically by introduction of random terms in the Ginzburg and Landau (GL) functional. For the scalar order parameter ψ such analysis has been made by Larkin and Ovchinnikov [4]. According to this analysis the most singular at $T \rightarrow T_c$ corrections to the order parameter originate from the term $F_\eta = N(0) \int \eta(\mathbf{r}) |\psi|^2 d^3r$ (here $N(0)$ is the density of states and $\eta(\mathbf{r})$ – a random scalar), which describes local variations of T_c . Generalization of this approach to the 3×3 complex matrix order parameter $A_{\mu j}$ is straightforward. Additional term in the GL functional has a form:

$$F_\eta = N(0) \int \eta_{jl}(\mathbf{r}) A_{\mu j} A_{\mu l}^* d^3r. \quad (1)$$

Now $\eta_{jl}(\mathbf{r})$ is a random tensor with zero average value. At the strength of $t \rightarrow -t$ invariance tensor $\eta_{jl}(\mathbf{r})$ is real and symmetrical, its isotropic part $\eta_{jl}^{(i)}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{3} \eta_{mm}(\mathbf{r}) \delta_{jl}$ describes local variations of $T_c = T_c(\mathbf{r})$ due to fluctuations of the density of scatterers, it couples only to the overall amplitude of the order parameter $A_{\mu l} A_{\mu l}^* \equiv \Delta^2$.

Effect of $\eta_{jl}^{(i)}(\mathbf{r})$ is similar to that for the scalar case – broadening of the transition and suppression of the absolute value of the order parameter. New properties originate from the anisotropic part $\eta_{jl}^{(a)}(\mathbf{r}) \equiv \eta_{jl}(\mathbf{r}) - \frac{1}{3} \eta_{ll}(\mathbf{r}) \delta_{jl}$ which describes local splitting of T_c for differ-

ent projections of angular momenta because of breaking of spherical symmetry by the aerogel strands. Contribution of $\eta_{jl}^{(a)}(\mathbf{r})$ to F_η depends on the particular form of the order parameter and on its orientation with respect to the aerogel. Correspondingly $\eta_{jl}^{(a)}(\mathbf{r})$ can both influence the form of order parameter and locally change its orientation. To make a qualitative guess of possible effect of $\eta_{jl}^{(a)}(\mathbf{r})$ for different order parameters one can start with a uniform order parameter and substitute it into F_η . No essential difference with respect to the scalar case is expected if $\eta_{jl}^{(a)} A_{\mu j} A_{\mu l}^* = 0$. This is the case for the BW-order parameter of bulk B-phase: $A_{\mu j}^{BW} = \Delta e^{i\phi} R_{\mu j}$, where $R_{\mu j}$ – a real orthogonal matrix, but not for the bulk A-phase (ABM). Its order parameter has a form: $A_{\mu j}^{ABM} = (\Delta/\sqrt{2}) \hat{d}_\mu (\hat{m}_j + i\hat{n}_j)$ with $(\hat{m}_j, \hat{n}_j) = 0$, then $\eta_{jl}^{(a)}(\mathbf{r}) A_{\mu j} A_{\mu l}^* \sim -\eta_{jl}^{(a)} l_j l_l \neq 0$, (here $l_j = e_{jik} m_i n_k$). This property of ABM-order parameter is of importance in connection with the identification of the A-like phase which has been observed in liquid ^3He in aerogel just below T_c [5, 6].

Disorienting effect of the random tensor $\eta_{jl}(\mathbf{r})$ on the ABM-order parameter has been emphasized by Volovik [7]. Following argument of Larkin [8] and Imry and Ma [9] he concluded that there may be no long-range order with the ABM-order parameter and suggested instead a glass state. In that state order parameter preserves ABM form locally but its orientation changes on a scale $L_{IM} \sim \xi_0/\eta^2$. Characteristic value of η^2 can be estimated e.g. from the measured width of the specific heat jump. This width is determined by the parameter $\alpha \equiv \eta^2/\sqrt{|\tau|}$ where $\tau = (T - T_c)/T_c$. A region where fluctuations dominate is determined by the condition $\alpha \sim 1$ [4]. For ^3He using the data of Ref.[10] for 22.5 bar one arrives at

$\eta^2 \sim 1/5$ and $L_{IM} \sim 5\xi_0 \sim 10^{-5} \text{cm}$.

Except for the disruption of the orientational order $\eta_{jl}^{(a)}$ influences a form of the order parameter. For the scalar case only amplitude of the order parameter can change and its relative change is of the order of $\alpha \ll 1$. For the triplet case the decrements of different components of $A_{\mu j}$ can be different. Moreover their change can be not small in case of degeneracy. For a triplet Cooper pairing there are altogether 18 extrema of the free energy [11] and some of them can come close in energy. Contribution of fluctuations to the energy being small in comparison with the full condensation energy can be comparable or larger then the small difference of energies of competing states. As a result fluctuations can shift the equilibrium and determine a choice of the order parameter. Let us consider this possibility in more details. With account of the random term GL functional takes the form:

$$F_{GL} = N(0) \int d^3r \left[\left(\tau + \frac{1}{3} \eta_{ll}(\mathbf{r}) \right) A_{\mu j} A_{\mu j}^* + \left(\eta_{jl}(\mathbf{r}) - \frac{1}{3} \eta_{mmm}(\mathbf{r}) \delta_{jl} \right) A_{\mu j} A_{\mu l}^* + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^5 \beta_s I_s + \frac{1}{2} \left(K_1 \frac{\partial A_{\mu l}}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial A_{\mu l}^*}{\partial x_j} + K_2 \frac{\partial A_{\mu l}}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial A_{\mu j}^*}{\partial x_l} + K_3 \frac{\partial A_{\mu j}}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial A_{\mu l}^*}{\partial x_l} \right) \right], \quad (2)$$

where I_s - 4-th order invariants in the expansion of the free energy over $A_{\mu j}$. Coefficients $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_5, K_1, K_2, K_3$ - phenomenological constants.

Because of a presence of $\mathbf{r}$ -dependent tensor $\eta_{jl}(\mathbf{r})$ in the functional (2) solutions of the corresponding GL-equations also depend on $\mathbf{r}$. It is convenient to separate the order parameter into its average $\bar{A}_{\mu j}$ and fluctuating part $a_{\mu j}(\mathbf{r})$ so that $A_{\mu j}(\mathbf{r}) = \bar{A}_{\mu j} + a_{\mu j}(\mathbf{r})$. Below T_c $\bar{A}_{\mu j} \neq 0$. The terms proportional to $\eta_{jl}(\mathbf{r})$ in Eq. (2) dominate at $T \rightarrow T_c$. Within a region $|\tau| \leq \eta^4$ or $\alpha \geq 1$ $a_{\mu j}(\mathbf{r})$ gives at least as important contribution to the physical quantities as $\bar{A}_{\mu j}$. It is difficult to analyze solutions of GL-equations within this region. Analysis is possible when $\alpha \ll 1$ and $|a_{\mu j}| \ll |\bar{A}_{\mu j}|$. In this region of parameters the iteration procedure of Ref.[4] renders equations for $A_{\mu j}$:

$$\tau \bar{A}_{\mu j} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^5 \beta_s \left[\frac{\partial I_s}{\partial A_{\mu j}^*} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^3 I_s}{\partial A_{\mu j}^* \partial A_{\nu n} \partial A_{\beta l}} \langle a_{\nu n} a_{\beta l} \rangle + 2 \frac{\partial^3 I_s}{\partial A_{\mu j}^* \partial A_{\nu n}^* \partial A_{\beta l}} \langle a_{\nu n}^* a_{\beta l} \rangle \right) \right] = - \langle a_{\mu l} \eta_{lj} \rangle. \quad (3)$$

and $a_{\mu j}(\mathbf{r})$:

$$\tau a_{\mu j} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^5 \beta_s \left[\frac{\partial^2 I_s}{\partial A_{\mu j}^* \partial A_{\nu n}} a_{\nu n} + \frac{\partial^2 I_s}{\partial A_{\mu j}^* \partial A_{\nu n}^*} a_{\nu n}^* \right] -$$

$$\frac{1}{2} K \left(\frac{\partial^2 a_{\mu j}}{\partial x_l^2} + 2 \frac{\partial^2 a_{\mu l}}{\partial x_l \partial x_j} \right) = - \bar{A}_{\mu l} \eta_{lj}, \quad (4)$$

Equations (3),(4) have the same structure as in the scalar case. Linear equation for $a_{\mu j}$ is solved by Fourier transformation and its solution has the following structure:

$$a_{\mu j}(\mathbf{k}) \sim \frac{A_{\mu l} \eta_{lj}(\mathbf{k})}{(\kappa^2 + k^2)}, \quad \kappa \sim 1/\xi. \quad (5)$$

Then for the average binary products entering Eq. (3) we have

$$\langle a_{\mu j} a_{\nu n} \rangle \sim A_{\mu l} A_{\nu m} \int \frac{\langle \eta_{lj}(\mathbf{k}) \eta_{mn}(-\mathbf{k}) \rangle}{(\kappa^2 + k^2)^2} \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3}. \quad (6)$$

These terms in Eq. (3) give corrections of a relative order of $\alpha \ll 1$ except for directions in which $\kappa = 0$ (Goldstone directions) when the integral diverges. This is the case for the increments of $\bar{A}_{\mu j}$ and $A_{\mu j}^*$ at the infinitesimal rotation θ_n :

$$\omega_{\mu j} = \theta_n e^{jn r} \bar{A}_{\mu r}, \quad \omega_{\mu j}^* = \theta_n e^{jn r} \bar{A}_{\mu r}^*. \quad (7)$$

The divergency means that contribution of the averaged products of projections of $a_{\beta l}$ in directions determined by $\omega_{\mu j}$ to Eq. (3) is of a relative order of α^λ , $\lambda < 1$. The value of λ depends on a mechanism of cutting-off the divergency. The mechanism is provided by anharmonicity. Previously suggested evaluation of the diverging integral from the condition $|a_{\beta l}| \sim |\bar{A}_{\beta l}|$ [12] overestimates it and renders $\lambda = 0$. Better estimation is obtained by keeping anharmonic (third order) terms in Eq. (4). The obtained nonlinear equation can be treated within a mean-field approach, i.e. the third-order terms are substituted as $aaa \rightarrow a \langle aa \rangle$, where a stays for any of components of $a_{\mu j}$ and only diverging binary averages $\langle aa \rangle_{\text{sing}}$ are kept. Thus obtained linear equation has solution of a symbolic form (all indices are suppressed):

$$a \sim \frac{Q \eta}{\Delta[(\xi_0 k)^2 + \beta \langle aa \rangle]}, \quad (8)$$

where $\beta \sim 1/T_c^2$ is a typical value of β -coefficients in the GL-expansion and Q is a tensor $Q_{rl} = \bar{A}_{\mu r} A_{\mu l}^* + \bar{A}_{\mu l} A_{\mu r}^*$. For binary averages in the Goldstone directions we have

$$\langle aa \rangle_{\text{sing}} = \text{const.} \frac{Q^2}{\Delta^2} \int \frac{\langle \eta \eta \rangle k^2 dk}{[(\xi_0 k)^2 + \beta \langle aa \rangle_{\text{sing}}]^2}. \quad (9)$$

This is an equation for $\langle aa \rangle_{\text{sing}}$. Its solution has a form

$$\langle aa \rangle_{\text{sing}}^{3/2} = \text{const.} \frac{Q^2 \langle \eta \eta \rangle_0}{\Delta^2 \sqrt{\beta} \xi_0^3}. \quad (10)$$

Here $\langle \eta \eta \rangle_0 = \int \langle \eta(0) \eta(\mathbf{r}) \rangle d^3 r$. With the aid of Eq.(8) $\langle aa \rangle_{\text{sing}}$ can be estimated as $\langle aa \rangle_{\text{sing}} \sim$

$(\Delta Q^2 \alpha)^{2/3}$. At $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ the singular terms in the GL-equation give a principal part of the contribution of fluctuations to this equation. GL-equation now has a structure:

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta A_{\mu j}^*} [F^{(0)} + F_{reg}^{fl} + F_{sing}^{fl}] = 0. \quad (11)$$

Consider a set of competing states which are nearly degenerate with ABM:

$$\left| \frac{F_c - F_{ABM}}{F_{ABM}} \right| \equiv \varepsilon \ll 1, \quad (12)$$

then, in Eq. (11) the first term is of the order of ε , the second - of the order of α and the third - of the order of $(\alpha)^{2/3}$. A character of solution depends on a relative values of small parameters ε and $(\alpha)^{2/3}$. If $\varepsilon \gg (\alpha)^{2/3}$ the order parameter is determined as a minimum of the unperturbed GL-functional $F^{(0)}$ (supposedly ABM-state) and fluctuations give small corrections to its form. In the opposite limit $\varepsilon \ll (\alpha)^{2/3}$ the form of the order parameter is determined by the fluctuations:

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta A_{\mu j}^*} [F_{sing}^{fl}] = 0. \quad (13)$$

This equation is satisfied if $Q_{jl} \sim \delta_{jl}$:

$$A_{\mu j} A_{\mu l}^* + A_{\mu l} A_{\mu j}^* = \text{const.} \delta_{jl}, \quad (14)$$

or, equivalently:

$$\eta_{jl}^{(a)} A_{\mu j} A_{\mu l}^* = 0. \quad (15)$$

As has been discussed above, for the order parameters, meeting condition (15) there is no disorienting effect of the random tensor $\eta_{jl}^{(a)}$ and long-range order is preserved. Generally this condition specifies a degenerate family of so-called "robust", or quasi-isotropic states. For partial lifting of the degeneracy the remaining terms in the free energy have to be minimized

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta A_{\mu j}^*} [F^{(0)} + F_{reg}^{fl}] = 0 \quad (16)$$

with Eq. (14) as a constraint. Eq.(16) determines in particular the overall amplitude Δ . It has to be verified then that the found solutions satisfy condition (12). If it is the case there exist a temperature region where condition $\varepsilon \ll (\alpha)^{2/3}$ is met as well since ε does not depend on temperature but α grows as $1/\sqrt{|\tau|}$ at $T \rightarrow T_c$. Within this temperature region the above procedure of finding solution of GL-equation which are determined by fluctuations is justified.

In case of A-like phase the competing states have to be of equal spin pairing (ESP) type. It follows from the

experimental observation that magnetic susceptibility of the emerging phase coincides with that of normal and ABM-phases [5]. A general form of the order parameter for ESP-state is:

$$A_{\mu j}^{ESP} = \Delta \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} [\hat{d}_\mu (m_j + i n_j) + \hat{e}_\mu (l_j + i p_j)], \quad (17)$$

where $\hat{d}_\mu$ and $\hat{e}_\mu$ are mutually orthogonal unit vectors, m_j, n_j, l_j, p_j - arbitrary real vectors. The order parameter $A_{\mu j}^{ESP}$ meets criterion (14) if vectors m_j, n_j, l_j, p_j satisfy the equation

$$m_j m_l + n_j n_l + l_j l_l + p_j p_l = \delta_{jl}. \quad (18)$$

A detailed description of this solution is presented elsewhere [13]. If additional constraint of the absence of spontaneous magnetization is imposed the obtained solution can be rewritten as:

$$A_{\mu j}^R = \Delta \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} e^{i\psi} [\hat{d}_\mu (\hat{b}_j + i \cos \gamma \hat{c}_j) + \hat{e}_\mu (\hat{a}_j + i \sin \gamma \hat{c}_j)], \quad (19)$$

where $\hat{a}_j, \hat{b}_j, \hat{c}_j$ - mutually orthogonal unit vectors, ψ and γ - parameters.

Now the condition (12) has to be verified. For the order parameter Eq. (19) ε is expressed in terms of coefficients β_i as:

$$\varepsilon = \frac{\beta_{13} - 4\beta_{45}}{9\beta_2 + \beta_{13} + 5\beta_{45}}, \quad (20)$$

where $\beta_{13} = \beta_1 + \beta_3$ etc. For the weak coupling values of β -coefficients $\varepsilon = 1/19$ i.e. small, but in that case BW-phase is more favorable than ABM. The most important are strong coupling corrections to the combination β_{45} since the weak coupling value $\beta_{45} = 0$ determines a boundary between ABM and axiplanar phases in the space of β -parameters [14]. For the moment it is difficult to make definite conclusions about the value of β_{45} realized in liquid ^3He . Combinations of $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_5$ deduced from the analysis of thermodynamic data [15] do not form a complete set and can not define ε without ambiguity. On the other hand the values of $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_5$ found theoretically from model assumptions [16] do not agree with the experimental findings in particular about β_5 .

Eq. (19) gives solution of GL-equation of a zeroth order on the small parameter $\varepsilon/\alpha^{2/3}$. In the real ^3He this ratio can be not very small so that the finite deviation from "robust" state occur and disorienting effect of the random tensor $\eta_{jl}(\mathbf{r})$ comes into play. The outlined procedure offers in that case only a local form of the order parameter. Principal contribution to the integral Eq.(9) comes from the wave vectors $(\xi_0 k)^2 \sim \beta < aa >_{sing}$, or length scales $L_{c-off} \sim \xi/(\alpha q^2)^{1/3}$, here $q^2 = Q^2/\Delta^2$ is the normalized deviation of the order parameter from the "robust" form. The local form of the order parameter is preserved if it changes its orientation in space

on a length scale which is much greater than L_{c-off} . This is the case for Imry and Ma disorienting effect: $L_{IM}/L_{c-off} \sim 1/(\alpha q^2)^{2/3} \gg 1$. The resulting glass-type state is based on a "nearly robust" state and the characteristic size of the "domains" is much greater than in the case of the ABM-based glass state. The most important difference between the two states is that the order parameter $A_{\mu j}^R$ unlike the $A_{\mu j}^{ABM}$ does not have the combined gauge-orbital symmetry. As a consequence the property of superfluidity for $A_{\mu j}^R$ is preserved even in the glass-type state. Formally it means that the averages of a type $\langle A_{\mu j}^R(\mathbf{r}) A_{\nu l}^R(\mathbf{r}) \rangle$ are finite and can be used as the order parameter of the "superfluid glass" state [17].

So, one can conclude that at a triplet Cooper pairing quenched disorder of a type of "fluctuations of the transition temperature" $\eta_{jl}(\mathbf{r})$ influences both form of the order parameter and its local orientation. There are "robust" classes of order parameters, for which disorienting effect disappears. If the form of the order parameter required by the minimization of the initial free energy is not "robust" there is a mechanism of adjustment which tends to bring the order parameter closer to the "robust" form and to decrease the disorienting effect of the random tensor $\eta_{jl}(\mathbf{r})$. Both disorienting effect and the mechanism of adjustment originate from degeneracy of the unperturbed free energy with respect to orbital rotations of the order parameter.

I acknowledge the hospitality of the Laboratory of Atomic and Solid State Physics of Cornell University, where final part of this work has been done. This research was supported in part by RFBR grant (no. 04-02-16417), by Ministry of Education and Science of Russian Federation and by CRDF grant RUP1-2632-MO04.

REFERENCES

1. J.V. Porto, J.M. Parpia, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 4667 (1995).
2. D. Sprague, T. Haard, J. Kysya, M. Rand, Y. Lee, P. Hamot, and W. Halperin *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 661 (1995).
3. A.A. Abrikosov and L.P. Gorkov, *ZhETF* **39**, 1781 (1961), [*Sov. Phys. JETP* **12**, 1243 (1961)].
4. A.I. Larkin and Yu.N. Ovchinnikov, *ZhETF* **61**, 1221 (1971).
5. B.I. Barker, Y. Lee, L. Polukhina, D.D. Osheroff, L.W. Hrubesh, and J.F. Poco, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 2148 (2000).
6. V.V. Dmitriev, V.V. Zavjalov, D.E. Zmeev, I.V. Kosarev, and N. Mulders, *JETP Lett.* **76**, 371 (2002).
7. G.E. Volovik, *Pis'ma ZhETF* **63**, 281 (1996) [*JETP Lett.* **63**, 301 (1996)].
8. A.I. Larkin, *ZhETF* **58**, 1466 (1970) [*JETP* **31**, 784 (1970)].
9. Y. Imry and S. Ma, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **35**, 1399 (1975).
10. Jizhong He, A.D. Corwin, J.M. Parpia, and J.D. Reppy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 115301 (2002).
11. V.I. Marchenko, *ZhETF* **93**, 141 (1987) (*Sov. Phys. JETP* **66**, 79 (1987)).
12. I.A. Fomin, *Pis'ma ZhETF* **81**, 362 (2005) [*JETP Lett.* **81**, 285 (2005)].
13. I.A. Fomin, *ZhETF* **125**, 1115 (2004) [*JETP* **98**, 974 (2004)].
14. N. D. Mermin, G. Stare, *Report 2186, Materials Science Center, Cornell University* (1974).
15. C.M. Gould and H.M. Bozler, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **113**, 661 (1998).
16. J.A. Sauls and J.W. Serene, *Phys. Rev. B* **24**, 183 (1981).
17. G.E. Volovik and D.E. Khmel'nitskii, *Pis'ma ZhETF* **40**, 469 (1984) [*JETP Letters* **40**, 1298 (1984)].